

Act. The article was labeled in part: (Jar) "Mt. Vernon Brand Apple Butter National Fruit Product Company, Incorporated, Washington, D.C."

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that it consisted in whole or in part of a filthy vegetable substance.

On June 15, 1933, the claimant having decided not to contest the action, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

M. L. WILSON, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

21078. Adulteration and misbranding of flour. U. S. v. 140 Sacks of Flour. Default decree entered. Product ordered delivered to unemployed. (F. & D. no. 30411. Sample no. 2996-A, 22022-A.)

This case involved a shipment of flour that was artificially bleached and was not labeled to indicate the fact.

On May 5, 1933, the United States attorney for the District of Minnesota, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 140 sacks of flour at Minneapolis, Minn., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce, on or about January 23, 1933, by Larabee Flour Mills Co., from Clinton, Mo., and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: "10 Lbs. Savage Diamond Quality Cake Flour M. W. Savage Factories, Inc., Minneapolis, Minn."

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that chlorine had been mixed and packed with the article so as to reduce, lower, and injuriously affect its quality, and for the further reason that artificially bleached flour containing added chlorine had been substituted for cake flour.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the statement "Cake Four" was false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser, when applied to artificially bleached flour. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article.

On June 21, 1933, no claim or appearance having been entered, and the court having found that the flour, while not complying with the requirements of the Food and Drugs Act, was fit for human consumption, judgment was entered ordering that it be delivered to an organization of the unemployed.

M. L. WILSON, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

21079. Misbranding of apple butter. U. S. v. 89 Cases of Apple Butter. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. no. 30485. Sample no. 33666-A.)

This case involved an interstate shipment of a quantity of apple butter, samples of which were found to be short weight.

On May 19, 1933, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Louisiana, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 89 cases of apple butter at New Orleans, La., alleging that the article had been shipped on or about March 1, 1933, by the Lippincott Co., from Cincinnati, Ohio, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended. The article was labeled in part: (Jars) "2 Lb. 3 Oz. Net Alameda Brand Apple Butter. Boone Products Corp. Cincinnati, O."

It was alleged in the libel that the article was misbranded in that the statement "2 Lb. 3 Oz. Net" was false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the food was in package form and the quantity of contents was not plainly and conspicuously marked on the outside of the package, since the quantity stated was incorrect.

On June 22, 1933, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

M. L. WILSON, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

21080. Adulteration and misbranding of butter. U. S. v. Sugar Creek Creamery Co. Plea of nolo contendere. Fine, \$75. (F. & D. no. 30159. Sample no. 20332-A.)

This action was based on an interstate shipment of butter, samples of which were found to be deficient in milk fat, since they contained less than 80 percent by weight of milk fat, the standard provided by act of Congress.

On May 8, 1933, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Illinois, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court an information against the Sugar Creek Creamery Co., a corporation trading at Pana, Ill., alleging shipment by said company, on or about August 25, 1932, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, from the State of Illinois into the State of Pennsylvania, of a quantity of butter that was adulterated and misbranded. The article was labeled in part: "Jersey Lily Brand Creamery Butter."

It was alleged in the information that the article was adulterated in that a product which contained less than 80 percent by weight of milk fat had been substituted for butter, which should contain not less than 80 percent by weight of milk fat as prescribed by the act of March 4, 1923.

Misbranding of the article was alleged for the reason that the statement "Butter" was false and misleading, and for the further reason that the article was labeled so as to deceive and mislead the purchaser, since the said statement represented that the article was butter, a product which should contain not less than 80 percent by weight of milk fat, as required by law, whereas it was not.

On June 15, 1933, a plea of nolo contendere to the information was entered on behalf of the defendant company, and the court imposed a fine of \$75.

M. L. WILSON, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

21081. Adulteration and misbranding of dried buttermilk feed. U. S. v. 100 Bags and 100 Bags of Dried Buttermilk Feed. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. no. 28225. I. S. nos. 18569, 18570. S. no. 6093.)

This case involved an interstate shipment of a product represented to be dried buttermilk feed. Examination showed that dried skim milk had been substituted in part for dried buttermilk, and that the article contained less than 6 percent of fat, the amount declared on the label.

On April 23, 1932, the United States attorney for the District of Maryland, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 200 bags of dried buttermilk feed at Pocomoke, Md., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce by W. G. Slugg, in part from Deerfield, Wis., on or about December 26, 1931, and in part from Tomah, Wis., on or about February 26, 1932, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: (Tag) "Slugg's Pure Dried Buttermilk Feed Manufactured by W. G. Slugg, Milwaukee, Wis. Guaranteed Analysis * * * Crude Fat Not Less Than 6% * * * Ingredients: Pure Milk Solids for Animal, or Poultry Feed and So Labeled."

It was alleged in the libel that the article was adulterated in that a substance, dried skim milk, deficient in fat, had been mixed and packed with the article, so as to reduce, lower, or injuriously affect its quality or strength, and had been substituted wholly or in part for the said article.

Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the following statements on the label, "Pure Dried Buttermilk Feed * * * Guaranteed Analysis * * * Crude Fat Less Than 6% * * * Ingredients Pure Milk Solids", were false and misleading and deceived and misled the purchaser. Misbranding was alleged for the further reason that the article was offered for sale under the distinctive name of another article.

On March 21, 1933, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment was entered ordering that the 18 bags of the product which had been seized under the libel, be condemned, forfeited, and destroyed.

M. L. WILSON, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

21082. Misbranding of canned pears. U. S. v. 75 Cases of Canned Pears. Default decree of condemnation and forfeiture. Product delivered to charitable institution. (F. & D. no. 29898. Sample no. 28089-A.)

This case involved a shipment of canned pears that fell below the standard established by this Department and were not labeled to indicate that they were substandard.

On March 10, 1933, the United States attorney for the District of Colorado, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 75 cases of canned pears at Pueblo, Colo., consigned by the Western Oregon Packing Corporation, alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce, on or about